

About the nature of dark matter and dark energy and a model of cosmology that may solve the cosmic coincidence problem

Isaac Cohen*

Physics Department, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02453

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

A model of cosmology, that arises from the hypothesis that ordinary matter, dark matter and dark energy are made of the same stuff, is studied. It is argued that this hypothesis is a consequence of considering space and time in the same footing. The model provides a solution to the cosmic coincidence problem predicting, without fine-tuning, values of $\Omega_m \approx 0.32$, $\Omega_\Lambda \approx 0.68$ and $\Omega_b \approx 0.04$ in agreement with observations. Besides, the model does not suffer from neither the flatness nor the horizon problems, does not appear to spoil the successes of cosmic nucleosynthesis calculations and allows for the formation of galaxies and clusters.

PACS numbers: 03.30.+p, 95.35.+d, 04.50.+h, 98.80.-k, 98.80.Es

Current astronomical observations give evidence for a spatially flat and accelerating universe. Type Ia supernova observations [1] convincingly reject the deceleration expected from an Einstein-de Sitter universe and indicate a cosmological constant of the same order of magnitude as the present mass density of the universe, anisotropy observations of the Cosmic Microwave Background radiation (CMB) pointing toward spatial flatness [2, 3]. Data from these observations fix the fraction of matter energy density to critical density to $\Omega_m \sim 0.3$ and the corresponding fraction associated to a cosmological energy to $\Omega_\Lambda \sim 0.7$. At the same time, CMB experiments limit the contribution of baryonic matter to only $\Omega_b \sim 0.05$, the rest being what is called dark matter, results that are in good agreement with the standard Big Bang nucleosynthesis.

In the same way that Einstein introduced a cosmological constant and carefully fine-tuned it with the express purpose of contravene the tendency of matter to produce deceleration, and obtain in that way an static universe, now we must contend with fine tuning parameters [4] such that the present value of the dark energy (or cosmological constant) be of the same order of magnitude as the present mass density of the universe. This is the *cosmic coincidence problem* [5].

Alternatives to the cosmological constant has been considered. In one proposal [6], the dark energy varies with time and is due to a homogeneous scalar field shifted away from the true minimum of its potential. These models [7] still need a fine-tuning in order to explain why this quintessence field comes to dominate only recently [8]. The failure to find a satisfactory model has led to the belief that some sort of anthropic principle must be at work [9].

Note that the observed dark matter to baryonic matter ratio is large. Recent measurements of the large-scale distribution of galaxies gives $\Omega_m = 0.27 \pm 0.06$ [10], supporting a large nonluminous matter to ordinary matter ratio. There have been proposed many candidates for dark matter, starting from ordinary material in some

nonluminous form, relics of the early universe, weakly interacting massive particles, supersymmetric particles and others [11].

It is the purpose of this note to propose a model of cosmology that arises from the hypothesis that ordinary matter, dark matter and dark energy are made of the same stuff. We will see that such a model gives account of the cosmic coincidence problem in a natural way. We consider the space time of real events extended to complex values and allow world lines of particles in some regions of this extended space time identifying them with either dark energy or dark matter. The metric in our restricted space time will be governed by all these contributions to the energy momentum tensor.

We may argue about the physics behind this extension: Notwithstanding the fact that in Einstein's special theory of relativity, space and time appears to be in the same footing, there is a basic distinction: Lorentz transformations leave invariant the form

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2, \quad (1)$$

for the interval ds between two events, with a relative minus sign between the time and space coordinates. We take $c=1$. This relative sign allows the existence of pairs of events with a null interval and hence to be connected by a light signal, giving then a distinct physical meaning to the odd coordinate. The distinction may be hidden if we require, as Minkowski did, that the time coordinate assume only imaginary values. Symmetry is only obtained if we allow all coordinates to assume complex values, but now the invariant group of transformations becomes the Complex Lorentz group. This is a well known extension. It is essential in a rigorous proof of the PCT theorem [12]. In this framework there is no preferred direction.

Let us consider any event as the origin of space and time coordinates of a four dimensional complex space in which the manifold extending along the real components of the space directions and the imaginary component of the time direction is the usual Minkowski space. This

manifold contains all the ordinary events. In this complex space there are, however, other manifolds whose points have three real coordinates and one imaginary. There are three of such generalized Minkowski spaces, all of them going through the origin. We may identify each of them by the character and name of its odd coordinate direction. The null cone that passes through the origin intersects each one of these spaces separating the regions in which $ds^2 > 0$ from the ones in which $ds^2 < 0$. Note that we may think of the odd coordinate direction as the axis of the projected cone.

If space and time are in the same footing then we should allow for matter in all these manifolds. Any particle whose world line is in any of these Minkowski spaces should contribute to the energy-momentum tensor of matter at the arbitrary point taken as the origin.

Our basic hypothesis is then that *ordinary matter, dark matter and dark energy are made of the same stuff. Particles whose world lines are geodesics inside the null cone in the manifold along the imaginary direction of t [13] would be considered ordinary matter. Particles whose world lines are geodesics inside any of the null cones in the manifolds along the imaginary directions of x , y and z would be considered dark matter. Particles whose world lines are geodesics outside any of the null cones of the four manifolds would be considered dark energy.*

Let us consider any of the Minkowski spaces along one of the imaginary space directions, say the imaginary direction of x . Inside the null cone, $ds^2 < 0$. In momentum space this means that the *mass*² of the corresponding particles are positive. We will associate, by hypothesis, these particles to darkmatter [14]. For example, particles whose geodesics are along the imaginary direction of x would contribute to the energy density and not to the pressure, because these particles will have energy but no momentum. This can be seen using a complex Lorentz transformation, the interchange between the x and t coordinates to connect our frame to the frame in which those particles are at rest.

Let us consider any of regions of these four Minkowski spaces outside the null cone, *i.e.*, where $ds^2 > 0$. In momentum space this means that the *mass*² of the corresponding particles are negative. In a isotropic model, the total contribution to the energy momentum tensor of such kind of particles from these four spaces should behave like an scalar under Lorentz Transformations. This is consistent with the hypothesis that associates them to dark energy [15].

For the construction of a model of cosmology we consider an spatial isotropic and homogeneous universe on our space time manifold. We assume, as usual, the validity of Einstein's field equations. They are

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R = -8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2)$$

with the sign conventions of [16]. The corresponding met-

ric has to have the Robertson-Walker form

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)\left\{\frac{dr^2}{1-kr^2} + r^2d\theta^2 + r^2\sin^2\theta d\phi^2\right\}, \quad (3)$$

We assume that matter fills homogeneously all the space so that Einstein's equations reduce to a pair of second order differential equations on the scale factor a , and by eliminating $\ddot{a}$, we obtain Friedmann's equation

$$\dot{a}^2 + k = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho a^2. \quad (4)$$

In addition the time dependence of ϱ is given by the continuity equation,

$$\dot{\rho} = -3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(\rho + p). \quad (5)$$

This also can be written

$$a\frac{d\rho}{da} = -3(\varrho + p). \quad (6)$$

As it is well known, we need only an equation of state $p = p(\varrho)$ to determine ϱ as a function of the scale factor a and then, by using equation (4) to solve for $a(t)$.

We estimate the equation of state in the following way: The total density ρ will receive contributions from: i) one share of ordinary matter density ρ_o coming from geodesics inside our manifold. ii) Three contributions of darkmatter each one coming from their corresponding manifolds. Each of these portions will be equal to ρ_o because the allowed space for geodesics inside the regions where $ds^2 < 0$ for all the manifolds are the same. iii) A portion of dark energy coming from each of the four manifolds. The allowed space for geodesics inside the regions where $ds^2 > 0$ is three times larger than inside the regions where $ds^2 < 0$. Then, each of these portions should be three times bigger than the previous ones. If we represent the dark energy fluid as made of particles of negative *mass*², $m^2 < 0$, the property that they have a momentum that is invariant under Lorentz Transformations means that these particles should have an energy density equal to $m/\sqrt{2}$. This gives an additional factor of $1/\sqrt{2}$ to the contributions from dark energy. For a matter-dominated universe we take the ordinary and dark matter contributions to the pressure as zero and the dark matter pressure as $p_\Lambda = -\rho_\Lambda$. In terms of the ordinary matter energy density ρ_o we have that the total density ρ and total pressure p are

$$\rho = \rho_o + 3\rho_o + 6\sqrt{2}\rho_o, \quad p = -6\sqrt{2}\rho_o. \quad (7)$$

We eliminate ρ_o from the above pair of equations to obtain the equation of state

$$p = \omega\rho, \quad (8)$$

with $\omega = -(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3})^{-1} \approx -.68$.

The equation (4) for a flat universe, $k=0$, gives the critical energy density ρ_c as $\rho_c = 3H^2/8\pi G$, where H is the Hubble constant. We define a density parameter Ω_x as the ratio of matter of type x to the critical energy density ρ_c . Equation (7) gives the relative proportions of each type of matter. For matter density ρ_m , that is the sum of ordinary matter and dark matter densities, we obtain the value $\Omega_m = 1/(1 + 3/\sqrt{2}) \approx 0.32$. For dark energy we obtain $\Omega_\Lambda = 1/(1 + \sqrt{2}/3) \approx 0.68$. These results are in agreement with observations [3].

For ordinary matter we obtain $\Omega_o = 1/(4 + 6/\sqrt{2})$. If we take in account that both particles and antiparticles are included as ordinary matter we find that $\Omega_b = 1/(8 + 12/\sqrt{2}) \approx 0.04$, in agreement with observations [17].

Solving equation (6) for ρ subjected to the equation of state (8) gives $\rho \propto a^{-3(1+\omega)}$ and hence we have that the energy density scales as $\rho \propto a^{-\frac{6}{2+3\sqrt{2}}}$, the exponent being ≈ -0.96 .

Using equation (4), For the case of a flat universe, we obtain that the scale factor grows as $a \propto t^\alpha$, with $\alpha = \frac{2}{3(1+\omega)}$. $\omega = -(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3})^{-1}$ this gives $\alpha = 2/3 + \sqrt{2} \approx 2.08$. If we fix the origin of time such that the scale factor $a(t)$ is zero at that time, $a(0) = 0$, the present time t_0 may be identified with the age of the universe. In that case we obtain a simple relation between the Hubble constant H_0 and the age of the universe t_0 , $H_0 \equiv \frac{\dot{a}(t_0)}{a(t_0)} = \alpha/t_0 \approx 2.08/t_0$. For the deceleration parameter $q_0 \equiv -\ddot{a}(t_0) \frac{a(t_0)}{\dot{a}^2(t_0)}$, we obtain $q_0 \approx -0.5$.

Taking $H_0 = 13.4 \text{ Gyr}^{-1}$ [3] one gets that the age of the universe is $t_0 \approx 28 \text{ Gyr}$. Recent observational evidence suggests that at redshift $z \approx 6$ is the epoch of reionization [18], where starlight dominated for the first time in the history of the universe. Now, the redshift z is given by

$$1 + z \equiv \frac{a_0}{a(t)} = \left(\frac{t_0}{t}\right)^\alpha, \quad (9)$$

For the elapsed time $\Delta t = t_0 - t$ since an event at time t , this gives $\Delta t = t_0(1 - (z + 1)^{-1/\alpha})$. The elapsed time since the epoch of reionization is then $\approx 17 \text{ Gyr}$. This is in agreement with studies of stellar ages using radio-isotopes [19].

If we assume that both ordinary matter and dark matter are relativistic, *i.e.*, a radiation-dominated universe, we have the same expression for the density as in the equation (7), but for the pressure p we have instead that $p = 4/3\rho_0 - 6\sqrt{2}\rho_0$. The equation of state is like equation (8) but now $\omega_r = -\frac{3-\sqrt{2}/3}{3+\sqrt{2}} \approx -0.57$. The energy density of radiation scales as $\rho_r \propto a^{-3(1+\omega_r)} \approx a^{-1.28}$. A flat universe filled with radiation would grow like $a \propto t^{\alpha_r}$ with $\alpha_r = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{3\sqrt{2}}{4} \approx 1.56$. Note that $\alpha/\alpha_r = 4/3$, the same ratio than in the Einstein-de Sitter universe. If one assumes that all energy is in thermal equilibrium with darkbody radiation, $\rho = \sigma T^4$, we can use the scaling behavior $a \propto t^{\alpha_r}$ for a flat universe filled with radiation

to find the dependence of the temperature T on time and the parameter α . Equation (4) gives then that the temperature T scales like $T \propto (\alpha_r/t)^{1/2}$,

$$T = \left(\frac{3}{8\pi G\sigma}\right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\alpha_r}{t}\right)^{1/2}, \quad (10)$$

where σ is the radiation density constant.

If the universe is flat, ($\Omega = 1$), then it will remain so for all time. We may rewrite equation (4) as $|1 - \Omega| = 1/\dot{a}^2$. This shows that in a nearly flat universe $|1 - \Omega| \propto t^{-2.16}$ for a matter-dominated universe or $\propto t^{-1.12}$ for a radiation-dominated universe. We don't have to fine-tune the initial conditions in order that the universe looks flat now. In consequence, the model we are considering does not have the flatness problem.

The particle horizon [20] defined by $r_{hor}(t_0) \equiv \int_0^{t_0} \frac{dt}{a}$ gives ∞ for a flat universe. This means that the range of causal interactions is infinite. There is no horizon problem [16, 21] in our model. Note that the satisfactory solution for the flatness and horizon problems that we have found are due to the fact that the model share with inflationary models [22] the property that the scale factor is accelerating $\ddot{a} > 0$. The similarities between inflationary models and the present model ends here because in inflationary models there is first an era of inflation pumped by a scalar field followed by a normal era in which the scale factor is decelerating. Here the scale factor keeps accelerating.

It has been argued [23] that comparable amounts of dark energy and matter in the early history of the universe would spoil the successes of cosmic nucleosynthesis calculations. We will show that this is not the case here. The argument relies in a calculation showing that the ratio η of the number of baryons to the number of photons exhibits a strong dependence on the temperature if there is a substantial component of dark energy and the observation that the temperature at which nucleosynthesis takes place depends on this ratio [23]. To be able to do the calculation they assume thermal equilibrium and that dark matter exchanges energy either with radiation or with matter. Here, we need only to require thermal equilibrium. We have that to maintain a Planck distribution, the energy per particle must redshift like the temperature, $T \propto 1/\sqrt{t} \propto a^{-3(1+\omega)}$. Taking in account the scaling behavior of ρ_r we find that the photon number density scales as $n_\gamma \propto a^{-\frac{3}{2\alpha_r}}$. On the other hand, the scaling behavior of the number density of baryons may be written as $n_b = a^{-2/\alpha}$. Their scaling behavior is, then, the same and in consequence the ratio $\eta \equiv n_b/n_\gamma$ is independent of the temperature.

It is important to see whether the model allows for the the formation of galaxies and clusters. We may wonder if a density perturbation may grow without limitations. It has been found that a cosmological constant should not be comparable to matter density at the time of galaxy formation [24]. In the model we are considering, the dark

energy is not constant but is decreasing. It is easy to see that in this case the proof does not give any bound. But as long as we take the scaling properties for the matter density already obtained, there is no bound even if for the sake of the argument we take the dark energy ρ_Λ as a constant. Let us follow Weinberg [24] modelling a perturbation as a sphere within which there is a uniform excess density $\Delta\rho(t)$, its evolution been controlled by a Friedmann equation

$$\dot{a}^2 + \Delta k = \frac{8\pi G}{3}(\rho_m + \Delta\rho_m + \rho_\Lambda)a^2. \quad (11)$$

If we take in account that the density scales as $\rho \propto a^{-3(1+\omega)}$ we have that

$$a^{3(1+\omega)}(\rho + \Delta\rho) = \text{const}. \quad (12)$$

The problem is whether the perturbed scale factor $a(t)$ increases to a maximum value and then collapse or whether there is no bound. The critical point occurs when the right hand side of equation (11) is equal to Δk . It is obtained that there is no minimum if $\omega < -1/3$. This is the case here. The conclusion is, then, that in this model a perturbation can increase without limit.

* icohen@brandeis.edu

- [1] A. G. Riess, *et al.*, *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998); S. Perlmutter, *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999).
- [2] A. Balbi, *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **545**, L1 (2000); P. de Bernardis, *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **404**, 955 (2000).
- [3] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, *astro-ph/0302209*.
- [4] S. Weinberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61**, 1 (1989).
- [5] This is also called the *new cosmological problem* to distinguish from the *old cosmological problem* that tries to understand why the vacuum energy is not very much larger than the present value [4]. We do not address the old cosmological problem in this paper. We take the constant vacuum energy to be zero.
- [6] B. Ratra, and P. J. E. Peebles, *Phys. Rev. D* **37**, 3406 (1988).
- [7] I. Zlatev, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 896 (1998); P. J. Steinhardt, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 123504 (1999).
- [8] S. Weinberg, *astro-ph/0005265*.
- [9] J. Garriga, M. Livio, and A. Vilenkin, *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 023503 (2000); S. Bludman, *Nucl. Phys. A* **663**, 865 (2000).
- [10] L. Verde, *et al.*, *arXiv:astro-ph/0112161*.
- [11] V. Trimble, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **25**, 425 (1987).
- [12] R. F. Streater, A. S. Wightman, *PCT, Spin and Statistics, and all that*, (New York, Benjamin 1964)
N. N. Bogolubov, *et al.*, *General Principles of Quantum Field Theory*, (The Netherlands, Kluwer, 1990).
- [13] We use the same letters x, y, z and t to indicate the real space and time coordinates and the corresponding complex ones. No confusion should arise because the distinction should be clear from the context.
- [14] Why are the standard model interactions between dark matter particles and ordinary particles suppressed?. It may be tried to be understood the same way as in scenarios in which the interactions of the standard model are confined to a four dimensional manifold of a certain thickness while gravitons could propagate freely in all dimensions. See N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. Dvali, *Phys. Lett. B* **429**, 263 (1998).
- [15] Tachyonic condensates has been used recently in cosmological models. See for example, G. W. Gibbons, *Phys. Lett. B* **537**, 1 (2002).
- [16] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*, (New York, Wiley, 1972)
- [17] L. M. Krauss, *astro-ph/0301012*.
- [18] R. H. Becker, *et al.*, *Astron. J.* **122**, 2850 (2001).
- [19] H. Schatz, *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **579**, 626 (2002); J. J. Cowan, *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **521**, 194 (1999).
- [20] W. Rindler, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **116**, 663 (1956).
- [21] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (Freeman, San Francisco, 1973).
- [22] A. H. Guth, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 347 (1981).
- [23] K. Freese, F. C. Adams, J. A. Frieman, and E. Mottola, *Nucl. Phys. B* **271**, 797 (1987).
- [24] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 2607 (1987).